DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 306 662 EA 020 905

AUTHOR Allison, Derek J.
TITLE Toward the Fifth Age: The Continuing Evolution of Academic Educational Administration.
PUB DATE Mar 89
NOTE 51p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, March 27-31, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; *Curriculum Development; *Curriculum Enrichment; *Educational Administration; Higher Education; *Relevance (Education)

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the future of academic educational administration. Specifically, it: defines the difference between academic and practial interests in educational administration; traces the evolution of academic study in educational administration; discusses how each major stage in this evolution has led to increased sophistication and complexity within the academic realm but, at the same time, has tended to further distance study from practice; examines recently proposed reforms in academic educational administration; and considers an alternative that would accommodate the current press for greater practical and experiential training in administrator preparation programs without sacrificing the future promise of academic study. The paper concludes by advocating the preservation and extension of academic study of educational administration in the following ways: (1) the history and philosophy of academic and practical educational administration should be taught; (2) wider attempts to understand schools as unique social phenomena within the literature of organizational theory should be considered; (3) closer and more penetrating treatments of the nature of power and authority in organizational settings must be reviewed; and (4) specific attention should be given to the subjective reality of organizational life. (JAM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED306662

Toward the fifth age: The continuing evolution of academic educational administration.

Derek J. Allison

The University of Western Ontario

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Derek J. Allison
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A paper prepared for a symposium on
The future relevance of the academic study of educational administration in the preparation of administrators.

Held during session 36.04 at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association
San Francisco, March 1989.

EA 020 905

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Toward the fifth age: The continuing
evolution of academic educational administration.

"From all sedition, conspiracy, and rebellion; from all false doctrine, heresy, and schism....Good Lord deliver us"

The Litany. Book of Common Prayer.

In his usual indomitable style, Daniel Griffiths (1988) issued a blunt challenge to Division A members attending last year's AERA convention. "I am thoroughly and completely convinced", he declared, "that, unless a radical reform movement gets underway--and is successful--most of us in this room will live to see the end of educational administration as a profession" (p. 1). A less apocalyptic tone was struck by John Greer (1989) in his recent presidential address to the University Council of Educational Administration [UCEA], but he too was very clear about the need for fundamental changes in the "nature and structure of departments of educational administration" and the programs they offer (p. 6).

The reforms advocated by Griffiths and Greer and first urged in the 1987 report of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration [NCEEA] are primarily intended to make preparation programs more relevant to the work and assumed needs of school administrators. To this end the reform agenda calls for departments of educational administration to abandon liberal arts traditions in favour of a professional school model of administrator preparation which would

"emphasize the application of knowledge and skills in clinical rather than academic situations" (NCEEA, 1987, p. 19). This proposal, and the press for increased practicality in preparation programs that lies behind it, calls into question the continued relevance and future prospects for educational administration as a serious field of academic study.

This paper seeks to address this important question. After an introductory discussion of the difference between academic and practical interests, the paper will trace the evolution of academic study in educational administration and discuss how each major stage in this evolution has lead to increased sophistication and complexity within the academic realm, but at the same time has tended to further distance study from practice. In the final section, the paper will discuss the recently proposed reforms and then consider an alternative which would accommodate the current press for greater practical and experiential training in administrator preparation programs without sacrificing the future promise of academic study.

Academic Educational Administration

As implied by the title, this paper is primarily concerned with the development and future of what I will call "academic educational administration". In this term, "academic" is meant to convey its generic meaning of being in and of the scholarly community of the university, with none of the pejorative or derogatory connotations of the word being intended or implied. Thus, academic educational administration might be operationally defined in terms of the characteristic activities undertaken, and the knowledge and culture consequently created and disseminated by, those who

work in university departments of educational administration. The point of using this term is to make a clear distinction between the world of the practitioner and the world of the academic; between the concerns and interests of principals and superintendents, and those of scholars and students; between doing and studying educational administration.

Distinguishing between the action and academic worlds of educational administration is crucial to the thesis of this paper, for I want to argue that each should properly be regarded as a separate realm with its own legitimate concerns and interests. This is not to imply or suggest that either can or should exist in isolation. The academic and the practical worlds naturally intermingle and overlap in many ways, and each must necessarily complement and inform the other. Indeed, from its beginnings to the present age, academic educational administration has always been concerned with the complementary practical world, as is entirely proper and appropriate for any applied field of academic inquiry. Even so, academics and practitioners typically view things of common interest in characteristically different ways. Those that must act within the real-time world of administration typically seek and value knowledge that will enable them to understand and deal sensibly with the immediately given: with their particular responsibilities and tasks; with the specific problems they encounter and decisions they must make; with ways of realizing their professional hopes and plans; and, ultimately, with ways of retaining and enhancing control over the organization and their future within it. While they may value such knowledge in their personal lives, the scholarly interests of those within the academic world characteristically encourage

them to seek broader, more abstract and conceptually complex ways of understanding the realm of administrative action: ways which will be generalizable beyond specific situations; which connect actions and events in broader settings; which describe and explain things and processes in new and powerful ways; which offer novel ways of interpreting the practical world and provide illuminating insights into otherwise commonplace phenomena.

Viewed in this way, academic educational administration must be seen as having an implicit relevance to the world and work of school administrators, and it must also be credited with the potential power to influence, alter, and even transform the world of action through the creation and dissemination of new ideas, techniques, insights and conceptualizations. This, of course, is by no means a new notion. Indeed, a belief in the implicit relevance and power of academic approaches to the practical world undergirds the very idea of the university, and has provided the touchstone rationale for the establishment and development of educational administration as a subject of study within universities. Further, the adoption of major new approaches and emphases in the evolution of academic educational administration has consistently been prompted by desires to enhance the relevance of academic activity to the practical world. Yet the increased conceptual complexity and sophistication within the academic realm brought about by these developments has inevitably intensified the characteristically different ways in which academics and practitioners view the world, further complicating the innate difficulties of translating and relating academic knowledge to practical things. Ironically, then, the evolution of academic educational administration appears to have progressively distanced and isolated the work

of university departments from the immediate concerns and interests of school administrators. This frustrating pattern of development has been exacerbated by the continued acceptance and pervasive influence of two deeply rooted assumptions. The first of these is that a science of school administration could be developed through academic work; the second, that school administrators can best be prepared for their roles by being trained in the emergent elements of this science through graduate degree programs offered by university departments of educational administration. The prevalence of these assumptions, and the ironic consequences of successive attempts to realize and apply the implicit relevance and power of academic approaches to the practical world, can be illustrated by a brief historical review.

The Evolution of Academic Educational Administration

University based approaches to the study and teaching of educational administration were first instituted in the United States a century or so ago, and for the most part the major developments in this academic domain have taken place within the context and culture of that country. Four broad but coherent stages in this evolution can be identified:[1] inception; practical science; theoretical science; and the current stage of conceptual complexity.

Inception: 1880-1910

In Tyack and Hansot's (1982) apt terms', the foundations for public schooling in the United States were laid by middle-class, part-time educational evangelists, but the expansion and consolidation of the system which occurred during the first half of the twentieth century was managed by a new class of "administrative progressives". "Whereas the educational

evangelists of the mid-nineteenth century aroused the citizenry against evils, the administrative progressives talked increasingly of problems to be solved by experts" (p. 106). There were indeed many practical and policy problems to be faced by the emergent class of professional school administrators, and a growing recognition among leading school and university administrators of the pressing need to codify and disseminate progressive ways of approaching and handling these problems stimulated the development of the first university courses in school management.

What Culbertson (1988) describes as the "first course to train principals and superintendents (p. 4, [emphasis added]) was established at the University of Michigan in 1881 by William Payne, who also published, in 1875, Chapters on School Supervision, which Culbertson hails as the first book on educational administration (p. 3). Other courses in school management were established in the 1890s at Teachers College Columbia University (p. 8), the Universities of Colorado and Indiana and apparently elsewhere (Newlon, 1934, p. 85-86). These developments were sufficient to lead Newlon (1934) to declare that "by 1900, educational administration was definitely established as a field of professional training" (p. 85). Even so, at the turn of the century there were no departments or professors of educational administration, and the available literature was exceedingly thin. The next decade, however, brought significant advances.

The major developments were stimulated by and focussed around Teachers College Columbia, which was destined to become the first temple of academic educational administration (Cremin, Shannon, & Townsend, 1954). A landmark event occurred in 1905, when the College awarded eight doctorates in

education, the two most notable graduates being Ellwood Cubberley and George Strayer, both of whom had specialized in educational administration (Culbertson, 1988, p. 8; Campbell, Fleming, Newell, & Bennion, 1987, p. 4). Columbia was also home to Dutton and Snedden, who published The Administration of Public Education in the United States in 1908, which likely reflects some of the specialized work done by Cubberley and Strayer in their doctoral work. At least five other new textbooks on school management and administration were also published between 1900 and 1910 (Newlon, p. 271), and by the end of this period several other universities had begun to provide opportunities for doctoral study in the field.[2]

The clearest indication that educational administration had become established as an academic subject, however, was the first national meeting of professors to discuss the future development of the field, papers from which were published in The Aims, Scope, and Methods of a University Course in Public School Administration, (Spaulding, Burris & Elliot, 1910). The tone of the meeting was optimistic, even eager. Not only was educational administration being studied in graduate courses within the university, the conceptual and methodological ingredients for sound scientific work were believed to be at hand in, respectively, Frederick Taylor's ideas of organizational efficiency and Edward Thorndike's new techniques of statistical measurement. Moreover, the need for well prepared professional school administrators to cope with the continuing problems of rapid growth and expansion, particularly in urban centres, appeared self-evident. Not all observers were convinced of the incipient maturity of the new field, however. Paul Hanus of Harvard, for one, declared that "a cynic, listening to the

discussion at the meeting, might have said that most of us were not yet ready to study school administration, much less to give a university course in that subject" (quoted by Culbertson, 1988, p. 10). This did not, of course, deter the faithful.

Practical Science: 1910-1950

Having established a firm, if slim, bridgehead in the universities, the pioneers of academic educational administration settled down to the serious work of building a corpus of specialist knowledge and applying their newly developed tools and techniques to the practical problems facing the schools and their administrators. Strayer, who remained at Columbia and published Educational Administration in collaboration with Thorndike in 1912, exercised a strong formative influence through his refinement and popularization of school survey techniques, and his pioneering and still influential work in school finance. On the other side of the nation, Cubberley, the "Wizard of Stanford", exerted an indelible and powerful influence on the development of both academic and practical educational administration through his prolific writings, his broad historical grasp of American education, and his steadfast advocacy of expert, efficient, executive school leadership. His mammoth and monumental historical survey, Public Education in the United States also helped form a national understanding of the roots and destiny of American schooling, some eighty thousand copies being sold between its publication in 1919 and the appearance of a revised edition in 1934 (Cremin, 1965, p. 5).

Yet while Strayer and Cubberley were without doubt the first high priests of academic educational administration, they were by no means alone in their simultaneous creation and advocacy of the gospel of professionalized,

executive management. Other notable professors appointed during the first half of this era included Butterworth at Cornell, Hart and Morphet at Berkeley, Henzlik at Nebraska, Mort and Norton at Columbia, and Sears at Stanford (Campbell, et al., 1987, p. 173).

Newlon's (1934) compilation of doctoral theses in educational administration submitted between 1910 and 1933 provides a useful picture of the extent of the academic community during this period, the 290 studies listed having been completed at 33 different universities. Newlon's list also dramatically illustrates the pre-eminent dominance of Teachers College at this time, with more than half (150) of the doctorates being earned at Columbia.[3] It further reveals how thinly the academic community was spread in other parts of the country, 12 of the listed theses representing the only doctorate in educational administration completed at the university concerned during the period surveyed. Still, an average of a little more than one completed doctoral dissertation each month over 23 years represented a significant achievement for the new field. A considerably greater number of students, of course, studied for Masters degrees, enrollments in these programs often being stimulated by the adoption of State certification requirements for school administrators in the middle and later years of this era. Many universities recruited instructors from amongst the ranks of locally experienced superintendents to teach in these programs and staff the courses in school management which were increasingly being taught in their teacher training programs. As a result, many of the professors that taught university courses in educational administration towards the end of this period possessed primarily professional, rather than academic, outlooks and

interests.

In many ways this development was an inevitable outcome of the period, for the great academics in the early decades of this age were intimately interested in promoting the professionalization of school administration, and they were remarkably successful in doing so. They did not accomplish this alone, for they had powerful allies in the form of influential superintendents and the spirit of the times. In the first place it is clear that the leading academics and superintendents shared a common vision of how schools should best be administered, but more importantly their respective efforts in promoting and implementing this vision were often intertwined and mutually supporting. Secondly, their vision of centralized, expert, executive, and above all, efficient, administration accurately reflected the then popular principles of Taylorism and promised to bring the soaring costs and confusion created by rapid expansion of public school systems, especially in the cities, sharply to heel. The success of the administrative progressives in promoting their reform agenda is partly illustrated in Callahan's (1962) well known account of how the ideas and ideals of quantified efficiency were zealously applied, and also in the more recent works by Berman (1983), Tyack (1974) and Tyack and Hansot (1982).

Academic educational administration made three major contributions to this transformation of American schooling. First, the textbooks, particularly those penned by Dutton and Snedden (1908; 1916), Strayer and Thorndike (1913), Cubberley (1919; 1922; 1923; 1928) and later Engelhardt (1931), Moehlman (1940) and Reeder (1941), constantly reiterated the fundamental precepts and values of efficiency through expert executive

administration, while typically supplying specific prescriptions as to how schools and school systems should be properly organized and administered. In many respects, they were virtual "bibles", which provided both direction and inspiration for established and aspiring administrators alike. But in addition to furnishing the expert knowledge that the new school managers needed in their work and fostering a growing sense of professional identity, the academics, particularly Cubberley through his best seller, also helped mould the way in which teachers, trustees and other influential middle-class literati came to view the function and role of school administrators, a view which, of course, was founded on the expectation of professionalized expertise. Second, the academic community actively supported the diffusion and application of progressive administration by placing promising graduate students in key superintendencies and assisting in their subsequent advancement. The "Columbia barons", particularly Strayer, Mort and Engelhardt, established and managed particularly effective webs of influence, mentorship and patronage, but professors at other universities also came to play important roles in the placement process as the network of academic educational administration developed during this era (Tyack and Hansot, 1982, p. 140-142).

Third, and most importantly for our purposes, the academic community created and disseminated a powerful form of practical science which had direct relevance to practising administrators and which was central to the transformation of American schools in the early and middle decades of this period. Strayer, Cubberley and the other influential academics were naturally interested in making educational administration scientific, for

then, as now, science was seen as a talisman of academic respectability. In that age, however, administrative science was viewed as having a less complicated character, and for the most part those who sought to first make academic educational administration scientific concentrated primarily on the quantification, measurement and comparison of variables which would yield facts about the functioning of schools and administrative systems, facts which could then be analyzed to identify weaknesses or demonstrate accomplishments. The roots of this science were embedded in the pioneering work in statistical measurement techniques initiated by Thorndike at Columbia in the first decade of this century and in Joseph Rice's earlier work on measuring student achievement. This developmental work led directly to standardized tests of student achievement, at least 300 of which had been developed by 1923 (Cubberley, 1934, p. 694), with more than 4,000 mental tests of various kinds being available by 1939 (Cohen & Lazerson, 1977, p. 375). The significance of this to the administrative progressives preoccupied with Tayloresque notions of quantified efficiency was unambiguously explained by Cubberley (1934):

> The important underlying purpose in the creation of all such standards for measuring school work...is to give to supervisors and teachers means by which they may, quite definitely, measure the effectiveness of the work they do, and learn from the charted results where to shift the emphasis and how to improve the manufacturing process. (p. 698)

Moreover, the ability to accurately measure the outcomes of the "manufacturing process" was understood as providing a powerful means of enhancing executive control over administrative and instructional practices

and policies, for as Cubberley (1934) further explained:

> For the superintendent, standardized tests have meant nothing less than the ultimate changing of school administration from guess work to scientific accuracy. The mere personal opinion of school board members and the lay public,...have been in large part eliminated, and in their place has been substituted demonstrable proof as to the validity of a method or procedure or the effectiveness of the administration or the supervision of a school system. (p. 698)

Standardized measures of achievement, and the I.Q. tests which appeared at the same time, were not a creation of academic educational administration, nor, of course, were they used solely for administrative ends. Even so, the testing movement itself created conditions which encouraged the development and deployment of measuring devices which had explicit administrative purposes. The development and widespread use of teacher rating scales during this period, for instance, certainly owes something to the measurement movement, as does the wide use of various scales to measure and compare the adequacy of school buildings. But the exemplar of practical administrative science in this age was the school survey, which was described by Sears (1922), who authored the definitive handbook on this process in 1925, as "a technique for the scientific study of educational problems" (p. 281, as quoted by Culbertson, 1988, p. 9). Early surveys, such as those undertaken at Boise, Idaho in 1910 and Montclair, New Jersey in 1911 (Cubberley, 1934, p. 695), concentrated on testing pupil achievement, but the technique developed into an omnibus process during which both student achievement and a host of other organizational and administrative variables were measured.

Often these surveys were conducted by external consultants, many of whom were from the academic educational administration community, but some large school systems introduced "continuous surveys of production made from within by the superintendent of schools and his staff" (Cubberley, 1934, p. 696). In many cases these internal surveys came to be conducted by specialist research units, which also conducted studies of other topics of specialist administrative interest such as "finance, accounting, attendance, budget preparation" and salary schedules (p. 696)."

The school survey movement had a powerful and profound effect on American schools. Hundreds of surveys were conducted at system and state levels during this era, and it appears that the results and recommendations produced often led to operational changes (Campbell et al. 1987, p. 140). The use of this form of practical science declined during the great depression, however, and it was not revived, at least in the full-blooded form popularized by Sears, in the post war years. A number of interesting developments did take place in academic educational administration as this age drew to a close, perhaps the most notable being the increasing interest in democratic forms of leadership reflected in Moehlman's (1940) text and other writings (Campbell et al. 1987, p. 141). But as this period drew to a close academic educational administration seemed mainly content to maintain the course set by its founders, and perhaps reflect on the great accomplishments in the earlier decades of the age. And in retrospect, they were great. In Newlon's (1934) words, academic educational administration had given "to government in this country the only administrative service staffed by executives who bring to their work extensive professional <u>training</u> and professional ideals" (p.

101 [emphasis added]).

Theoretical Science: 1950-1975

The post war years brought with them new values, new ways of understanding and responding to social issues, and rapidly rising school enrollments, all of which placed educational administration, in both its action and academic realms, under strain. With financial support from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration was launched in 1950 with the main aim of adjusting to these changes through enhancing the quality of graduate preparation programs. The success of this program encouraged some thirty or so universities with larger departments of educational administration to support the creation of the University Council of Educational Administration [UCEA] in 1956. This organization soon came to exert a dominant influence over the development of study and teaching in the field, even though the majority of North American professors of educational administration taught in non-UCEA affiliated universities. These developments in the institutional infrastructure of academic educational administration were driven by large increases in graduate enrollments, particularly in doctoral programs, with some 1,500 doctorates in educational administration being earned annually in the late 1970's (Ortiz & Marshall, 1988, Table 6.3).

By far the most important development, however, was the dramatic change in the focus of academic work being done in the field as a consequence of the advent of the Theory or New Movement. Much has been written about how this paradigm shift came about, and the details need not concern us here. The main point to be made is that while the New Movement was initiated for sound

academic reasons, it was understood as being ultimately dedicated to better serving practical ends.

In the transformed social and scientific climate of the post war years, the academic knowledge inherited from the previous age was deemed inadequate. Textbooks were considered to be far too prescriptive, too preoccupied with concrete minutiae and out-of-phase with the social and educational realities and values of the times. Getzels, for example, in personal correspondence quoted by Culbertson (1988, p. 15), declared that the textbooks in educational administration that he examined in the early 1950's in an attempt to divine the conceptual foundations of the field "seemed more like training manuals than conceptual or research treatises". Similarly, the research being done was limited and weak. Most studies undertaken were largely based on the fact-gathering, school survey based, traditions inherited from the practical science era; questionnaire driven methodologies were common, coherent conceptual foundation infrequent, and few, if any, of the advances in thinking that had taken place in the broader realms of social science were evident. These weakness were pointed out by new professors who took up appointments in departments of educational administration after receiving their academic training in other social science fields. With the able help of some recent graduates from doctoral programs in educational administration, this new breed of academics set out to modernize the field.

In the article in which he first outlined the ingredients of what was to become the famous and massively influential "Getzels-Guba model", Getzels offered a paragraph that provides perhaps the clearest statement of the academic rationale behind the New Movement:

> Systematic research requires the mediation of theory--theory that will give meaning and order to observations already made and will specify areas where observations still need to be made. It is here that we would place the root of the difficulty in educational administration: there is a dearth of theory-making. (1952, p. 235, as quoted by Culbertson 1988, p. 15)

He was, of course, completely correct in both his diagnosis and his general prescription. for the understandings of the purposes and the processes of educational administration inherited from the practical science era needed an extensive conceptual reappraisal and overhaul. This did not really happen, however, for it was believed that an ample supply of conceptual material, theoretical perspectives and appropriate research methods and techniques was readily at hand in the neighboring social sciences. Advances in the broader domains of organizational and administrative theory appeared particularly appealing, and a sustained period of often indiscriminate pillaging of this literature began, supplemented with occasional forays into the fields of social-psychology and political science. This resulted in considerable academic gains: new ways of understanding organizations and the administrative process proliferated; research became far more theoretically oriented and methodologically sophisticated; the field broadened and deepened as a more generic understanding of educational administration emerged and professors and students became interested in novel perspectives, problems and possibilities; a new scholarly literature emerged and grew rapidly with the advent of specialized academic journals while textbooks became far less prescriptive

and position focussed in favour of the presentation and analysis of conceptual models and research findings. In short there was an explosion of academic work, the broad scope and main fruits of which can be seen in the recent compendium edited by Boyan (1988).

These academic developments were undeniably exciting, but most appeared to have no immediate relevance to the practical worlds of principals or superintendents. Many of those that earned graduate degrees in the transformed departments of educational administration found that the course material was interesting stuff, especially if there were professors around who could clearly explain the new ideas and concepts and if they could find the time to "do the readings" in their characteristically part-time programs, but that the models, theories, and findings which were presented to these prospective or practicing principals and superintendents often appeared to them to lack any immediate relevance to the problems they would have to handle on Monday morning. This perception, of course, was substantially correct, for the conceptual knowledge which came to form the core of these programs was never intended to provide specific answers to particular practical problems. On the contrary, it was initially created to provide the "meaning and order to observations" of the world referred to by Getzels above, and when presented in textbooks and seminar rooms was intended to offer generalizable ways of thinking about and gaining new understandings of generic aspects of educational administration. Ultimately, then, the usefulness of the new knowledge produced by the theory movement lay in the characteristic implicit relevance which any domain of academic inquiry has for the aspects of the world it addresses, rather than in any particular set

of practical solutions which academic work may be able to offer to the ever-changing, always pressing and locally complex issues, concerns and problems in the realm of action.

Such an understanding of the implicit rather than direct relevance of modern academic knowledge of educational administration is now recognized in the literature, but at the beginning and throughout much of this period--and still today in some quarters of the field--the new movement was expected to yield knowledge which would have direct practical relevance to the work of educational administrators. Many of the key assumptions that guided and constrained approaches to the study of educational administration during this period were grounded in Herbert Simon's (1945) Administrative Behavior (Culbertson, 1988, p. 14; Greenfield, 1986). As discussed in more detail by Greenfield (1986), Simon's approach rejected earlier understandings of administrative action--which were defined by March as consisting of any such knowledge that pre-dated 1950 (p. 58)--in favour of an objective, scientific analysis of administration as a technical process in organizations. For Simon, and for the founders of the New Movement, science was clothed in her then modern robes as originally crafted by the logical-positivists of the Vienna Circle (Culbertson, 1983). Thus, educational administration was to be properly studied on the basis of objective observations informed by operationally defined concepts and directed and ordered by explanatory theories which would ideally take the form of "'hypothetico-deductive systems'....'from which can be derived by purely logico-mathematico [sic] procedures a larger set of empirical laws'" (Halpin, 1958, as quoted by Culbertson, 1988, p. 17). As clearly implied by this celebrated definition

of theory borrowed from Feigl and much venerated during the high years of the new movement, Simonesque science was expected to yield theoretical knowledge that would guide and inform administrative practice. In Greenfield's words:

> Such theory, it was held, would produce control over organizations in the same way that it permitted control over the physical world. The aim of the New Movement in educational administration was to generate such theory about schools, to place it in the hands of administrators, and to train them in its use. (p. 65, [emphasis added])

In this way, the theoretical science period in academic educational administration was originally understood as a way to produce knowledge which would be directly relevant to the action realm of administrative practice. Whereas the practical science of the previous age had been intended to yield facts which could provide the basis for action and support the legitimacy of professionalized expert executiveship prescribed in the Cubberlian doctrine, New Movement theoretical science was to furnish knowledge that would actually guide and inform action.

The high tide of this vaulting optimism crested early. Although papers from the second Chicago theory seminar were published under the revealing title of Administrative theory as a guide to action (Campbell & Lipham, 1960), leaders of the movement were already recalibrating their original high expectations. While their faith in the power of positivistic science remained secure, the prospect of developing a general theory of administration was being increasingly seen as a remote, perhaps ultimately unreachable ideal, and attention was being directed toward selected aspects of organizational functioning and administrative behavior. Nonetheless, the

underlying rationale of generating practice-relevant knowledge through positivistic science and disseminating this knowledge to principals and superintendents via graduate programs and other media remained as the dominant motif during this period.

Conceptual complexity: 1975-Present

Griffiths (1988, p. 30) declared that after being in decline for perhaps a decade, the theory movement received its coup-de-grace from Greenfield's (1975) now famous address to the 1974 IIP meeting in Bristol. While Greenfield certainly laid the original optimistic hopes for a theoretical science of educational administration to final rest, his first shots at the positivistic beasts that had come to graze in field of academic educational administration during the age of the New Movement scarcely wounded, let alone dispatched, them. Indeed, even a cursory glance through the pages of any recent issue of Educational Administration Quarterly (or the program for this convention) will show that the key notion of studying organizational functioning and administrator behavior as objective, quantifiable, predictable, phenomena is still very much alive, and even kicking. Yet a review of the contents of this flagship journal over the last decade or so will also show the emergence of a variety of new emphases and approaches, a development which is even more marked in the broader literature. Thus, while Greenfield's initial attack on the epistemological foundations of theoretical science did not result in the overthrow of the construct and meta-paradigms characteristic of that previous period, it can certainly be taken as a landmark event which signifies the dawn of a fourth age in the evolution of academic educational administration.

This present age is characterized by, on one hand, the wide variety of the different orientations to the study of educational administration that are currently in use and, on the other, by the greater emphasis which many of the new approaches place on conceptually derived and informed understandings. While theory building remains an important activity, the narrow, positivistic ideal of theory epitomized by the grotesque Feigl definition has been succeeded by a much broader, more fluid, and contingent understanding which allows for diverse approaches to coexist and be pursued. Qualitative research methods have blossomed, while quantitative techniques have become more sophisticated and powerful. In this context many of the new approaches that have emerged seek to understand administration through the power of discipline based insights, ideas and concepts. Thus, Bates (1983) and others have brought the power of Marxist critical theory to bear on the complexities of educational administration, while Hodgkinson (1978; 1983) has offered philosophical analyses of administration. In short, the single conception understandings of science that dominated each of the previous ages is being rapidly replaced with a much more flexible image of science as a dynamic, multi-facetted, multi-level knowledge generating and validating process.

Once again, however, the emergence of this new era of conceptual complexity was stimulated by a desire to increase the relevance of academic work to the realm of practice. The fundamental point of Greenfield's original denouncement of theoretical science was that Simonesque positivism was constitutionally incapable of yielding knowledge which could serve as a practical guide to administrative action, and thus whatever knowledge was generated through this approach would be inherently irrelevant to the

realities faced by principals and superintendents in the action realm. Consequently, he and others have consistently argued that academic educational administration should seek to develop more realistic and complete understanding of the indigenous complexities of the practical world by adopting approaches which are grounded in humanistic, rather than positivistic, assumptions. Such approaches would embody a more respectful and reflective attitude toward the experienced reality of administrators, with the main intent of simply helping them, and those who wish to join their ranks, to better understand the inherent complexities of their work. As recently expressed by Greenfield,

> Scientists inspired by positivism approach administrators with the conviction that their theories and methods enable them to know administration in a way mere practitioners never could. The reverse assumption now seems a better point of departure: administrators know administration; scientists don't. The point of such inquiry would be to enable scientists to come to know what administrators know and to bring a fresh and questioning perspective to it. (1986, p. 75)

In the context of the ideas developed in this paper, this argument is an argument for capitalizing unashamedly on the implicit relevance and power of academic approaches. Rather than attempting to dedicate and constrain academic work in educational administration to the production of either a practical or theoretical science of administration as in previous ages, this emergent stance would concentrate more directly on the study of administration. Rather than attempting to prescribe ideal practice, such study would seek to better understand and thus inform the realities of

administrative action. Rather than assuming that academic work could and should concentrate on producing superior solutions to practical problems, a far greater emphasis would be placed on the ancient and always powerful academic practice of seeking to ask better questions. Rather than continuing the long established tradition of preparing administrators by attempting to train them in the dubious fruits of practical or theoretical science, the advent of such an orientation might also lead to graduate programs based on the unique and time-honored power of academic approaches to provide empowerment through education.

But these are only distantly glimpsed possibilities that might be realized if the evolution of academic educational administration continues into a possible fifth age. At the present time the conceptual complexity which currently characterizes the field has been described alternatively by Greenfield (1986, p. 74) as "intellectual disarray", and by Griffiths (1979; 1988, p. 40) as "intellectual turmoil", while Culbertson (1988, p. 18) has described the theory movement as currently being in "an embattled state". These internal perceptions of disarray and apparent confusion underestimate the inherent strength that resides in the growing diversity of the field, but they also communicate a sense of impotence to outside observers. From the perspective of practitioners and regulatory agencies, academic educational administration seems unable to deliver on its promises. Not only did the theoretical science era fail to create a workable science of school administration, the university programs which were supposed to train a new generation of school administrators appear to be producing graduates who are ill-equipped to handle the practical realities of the world of action. As if

this was not bad enough, rather than setting its own house in order the academic community appears more interested in debating ever more esoteric points which seem even further removed from the pressing problems of the practical world. Which brings us back where this paper began, and the dubious future for academic educational administration prescribed by the UCEA founded Commission on Excellence and endorsed so enthusiastically by Griffiths and Greer.

Alternative Scenarios for the Fifth Age

My main purpose in tracing the evolution of academic educational administration to this point was to try and show first, that it has a longer and deeper history than is commonly acknowledged in the contemporary literature; second, that it has progressed though a number of essentially evolutionary stages, each one of which has enhanced the scope and sophistication of academic work; third, that each new stage was initiated in an attempt to make the academic field more directly relevant to the complementary practical world of action; so that, fourth, prospective administrators might be better prepared; but that, fifth, despite continued attempts to increased the direct relevance of the academic realm to the practical, the main strength of the field has consistently resided in the implicit relevance of academic work and thinking; the potential power of which has been, sixth, considerably enhanced with the advent of the conceptual complexity which currently characterizes the field. Viewed in this broad context it seems that the academic world of educational administration could well be on the verge of a new, more robust stage of development which could lead to the dawn of a fifth age of mature and

sustained academic study.

The current education reformation movement in the United States, morecver, has generated pressures for changes in the established form and content of administrator preparation programs intended to make them more directly relevant to the practical world of school management. The force of these pressures seems such that some kind of change along these lines appears inevitable, the consequences of which will force the development of a fifth stage in the development of academic educational administration in the United States regardless of the evolutionary forces at work in the broader international field as a whole. Thus a fifth age in academic educational administration appears imminent. The crucial question is, what will be its character? Will it be the age of academic maturity promised in the continuing evolution of the field and outlined earlier, or will it be an age where a newly revived preoccupation with training subordinates academic gains to resurgent practical interests and values? The reforms to preparation programs proposed by the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration [NCEEA] and enthusiastically endorsed by Griffiths (1988) and Greer (1989) strongly imply the second of these possible futures. Indeed, I fear that the reform agenda threatens to sacrifice the last forty years of growth toward academic maturity on the altar of practical expediency.

Devolution toward the ideals of past ages

The establishment of the NCEEA by UCEA can be seen as part of the broader educational reform movement within the United States that was initiated by the release of A Nation at Risk in 1983 (Passow, 1989). Both the inception

of the Commission and its recommendations were very much in tune with the 4E values of excellence, efficiency, effectiveness, and equity that permeate America's modern educational reformation, while the specific solutions offered embodied the notions of relevance, practicality and rededication that are key elements in the broader renewal movement. One might argue, then, that these calls for fundamental change need not concern those of us who work in departments of educational administration outside the United States. This would an incorrect and dangerous interpretation. As well as being the cradle for the university based study of educational administration, the United States remains a dominant force in the field and significant changes in the nature, mission and work of its university departments will have repercussions for academic educational administration in other nations. Moreover, major developments in American educational policy and practice often influence other nations, particularly Canada of course, and as similar dissatisfactions with the educational sector are already evident in other countries, similar solutions to the perceived problems may well be adopted. Those of us who study and practice educational administration outside the United States thus have a legitimate interest in the content of the proposed reforms to administrator preparation programs and their likely effect on academic work and development in educational administration.

The NCEEA reforms subsequently highlighted and embellished by Griffiths and Greer are primarily designed to increase the practical relevance of future administrator preparation programs by adopting a more clinical and experientially based approach to training. University departments and their graduate programs would abandon liberal arts traditions and assumptions,

including perhaps the Ph.D, in favour of professional model of administrator training leading to a reconstituted and standardized Ed. D., or possibly new DEA; programs would be conducted in close cooperation with school systems which would help determine content and provide opportunities for clinical experiences; the knowledge base would be restructured to directly address "problems of practice" (Griffiths, 1988, p. 20), with research being focussed on problems of "real significance" in schools (p. 23); finally, the university departments that are to offer and be ultimately responsible for the success of these new programs would be overhauled to ensure that they were sufficiently well staffed and funded to effectively pursue their prime mission of training principals and superintendents.

The main dangers of these reforms reside in the way in which they seek to retain university level control over programs of administrator preparation while simultaneously subordinating the legitimate interests and strengths of the academic realm to the those of the practical world. This will inevitably result in a trivialization of academic interests, which will tragically forfeit the immense gains promised by the growing scholarly maturity of academic educational administration. Indeed, the proposed changes appear to be largely based on and justified by a desire to regress the field toward the purposes, values and expectations exemplified in the earlier practical science era, with the knowledge presented being drawn mainly from that produced during the theoretical science age. Supporters of the proposed reforms will no doubt dismiss such gloomy prognostications, by pointing out that the first of the five "strands" that would make up the new preparation programs would be "the study of administration" (NCEEA, p. 19), or as

Griffiths (1988) more tellingly describes it. "The Theoretical Study of Educational Administration" (p. 15, emphasis added). Griffiths goes on to explain that such study would encompass "what is now considered traditional: social systems, decision-making, contingency theory. bureaucracy, and the Barnard-Simon equilibrium theory", but that "equal attention should be given to the new theories and approaches to understanding organizations" (p. 15-16).

Leaving aside the wonder evoked by the shotgun-marriage of Barnard and Simon in this outline, it is clear that what is essentially being proposed here is a dose of the core knowledge and assumptions that became established in the literature during the theoretical science era. Well and good, at least in principle, for it seems evident that initial graduate study in the field should take stock of this important body of literature. The implication that emerges from Griffiths' (1988) outline, however, is that this knowledge would be presented as if it constituted the main substance of the available academic knowledge in the field. Moreover, one receives the uneasy impression than this knowledge would be taught, rather than critically evaluated, an impression that is strengthened when the balance of the academic strand is outlined. Here, it appears, students would receive a review of current issues confronting administrators, such as "the nature of the curriculum, moral and ethical issues, how to deal with children with AIDS, the minority question" (p. 16) and so forth. Again, the basic notion here seems sound, for an appropriately balanced and informed reviewed and analysis of contemporary social conditions and issues is clearly an appropriate element of the education of administrators, but again one senses

that this is not really the objective, for the emphasis appears to be on training prospective administrators in how to manage issues, even specific issues, rather than understand them. Yet, even if the former emphasis is intended, this course would apparently conclude the academic content of this first strand offered in the department of educational administration, with whatever additional scholarly work might be done being taken from other university departments. Thus, if we take out the issues course (which Griffiths suggests might be taught by interdisciplinary faculty), the only direct exposure which students would receive to the disciplinary literature would be whatever was covered in the first component. Clearly, more than a single course is intended here, but one must wonder how much of worth in the now vast and varied literature of academic educational administration could be dealt with in the limited time that would be available.

Nevertheless, the teaching contributions of the department of educational administration would not be limited to the "study of administration" strand, for specialist instruction would also be provided through the study of the "technical core of educational administration" in the second stand of the program. Here the attention would be given to the specialized areas that have formed a part of professional study in the field since the Dutton and Snedden text made its appearance. In the reformed programs, however, this course

> would be taught from the orientation of managing experts in each core area. The components of the course would include: supervision of instruction, curriculum building and evaluation, finance, law, personnel, school-community relations, pupil personnel, physical facilities, and

school business management. (Griffiths, 1988, p. 16)

In addition, non-credit training would be given in "the basic skills of administration" such as "talking, writing (memos, announcements, public relations releases), conducting meetings of various sizes, conducting interviews" (p. 17) and so forth, such instruction being given through a skills centre within the department. Finally, in the third strand the department would also offer instruction in applied research. Here the parallel with the practical science notions of the Cubberlian era are clearly apparent for "the students would be taught how to solve problems through the use of both quantitative and qualitative research methods, as well as decision-making techniques" (p. 17).

The other two strands of this supposedly ideal professional preparation program would consist of supervised practice through internships and other forms of clinical experiences and, finally, a demonstration of competence. In conformity with the values underlying the other strands, this culminating component "would not result in a research thesis", but would focus on some form of "demonstration that the student has really learned something about performing as an administrator" (p. 18). Successful completion of these five strands would lead, bizarre as this might seem, to a university graduate degree which would, ideally, be a professional doctorate, either an Ed.D.. or possibly a DEA (Greer, 1989, p. 7). Thus, although departments of educational administration that adopted this kind of program would of necessity work closely with local school systems, these departments would retain ultimate control over the program through their specification of the degree requirements.

If such programs become established, then the evolution of academic educational administration will be surely halted, at least in the United States. Nor can much solace be in found the academic work which might continue in university departments outside of such new preparation programs. Greer (1989) declares quite clearly that "we must find a way of scrapping the liberal arts tradition that conditions the nature and structure of our work and our departmental programs", declaring a little latter, should the point be missed, that "our scrapping of the liberal arts tradition should be total" (p. 6, [emphasis added]). Indeed, not only will the evolution of academic work in the field be summarily halted, in many ways it appears as if the thrust of these reforms is to try and return the field to the ambitions, and values--in some senses even the knowledge--that prevailed in the practical science era. In retrospect, that era represented by far the most successful attempt to develop a professional body of expertise and train practitioners in its use, and thus a desire to return to the principles on which this past glory was founded is perhaps understandable. Moreover, an uneasy parallel can be drawn between the social values that encouraged the rise and establishment of administrative progressivism at the beginning of that era with its emphasis on efficient, executive, management and the 4E values undergirding the present educational reformation in the United States.

Ingredients for an alternative future

Is there a realistic alternative to these proposed reforms and the emasculation of academic educational administration that they will bring with them? In the context of the demand for enhanced relevance in administrator

preparation programs the challenge is to find a model which will foster and take advantage of continued scholarly growth and sophistication in academic educational administration while at the same time providing appropriate opportunity for experiential learning in the realm of administrative action. The ingredients for such a model are, perhaps paradoxically for my argument, contained within the five strands of the proposed reforms. The crucial difference lies in the way in which these strands would be woven together and in how the overall program would be coordinated and controlled.

The "professional school" model of preparation advanced and employed by Griffiths, Greer and the NCEEA seeks to bridge the boundaries between the academic and action realms of educational administration with a view to blending together the activities and interests of professors and practitioners in a common commitment to understanding and dealing with "problems of practice". In this osterized model "responsibility for preparing educational administrators would be shared with the profession and the public schools". (Griffiths, 1988, p. 13-14) The university "should provide the intellectual dimension of preparation", Griffiths explains, "while the profession and the public schools" should cooperatively attend to "the clinical aspects of the program" and "bear major responsibility for supervision of field activities including the internship and the solution of practical problems in university classes", (p. 14).

The conception of "the profession" embedded in this division of responsibilities and promoted throughout Griffiths' and Greer's papers deliberately attempts to separate professors of educational administration from their institutional base in the university and number them with

practicing school administrators. This is a crucial element in the model of professional preparation promoted by the reformers, but it is by no means an accurate description of the current situation, nor is it necessarily desirable or even logical. On the contrary, viewed in the light of the evolution of academic educational administration presented here it appears as an anachronistic conception which once again reflects the ideals of the second age in the development of the field, rather than the academic strength inherent in the current age of conceptual complexity. In this sense, the omnibus conception of "the profession" being advanced by Griffiths must be seen as an inherently flawed notion which promotes muddled thinking about the proper and legitimate role of university departments of educational administration in modern times. A far more sensible and accurate approach would recognize and attempt to build on the very real and important institutional and phenomenological differences between the inhabitants of academic and action worlds of educational administration that have been stressed throughout this paper. This preferable view would thus distinguish between the profession, composed of those who actually administer schools, and the academics who study educational administration.

This does not imply that there is no virtue in experiential approaches to the preparation of school administrators. To the contrary, it makes good sense to provide prospective school administrators with some kind of mediated exposure to, and involvement in, the realities of administrative work. Indeed, there is much to be said for this approach for surely the best way to learn about the working realities of administration is to be a principal, or superintendent, or work closely alongside one. But on what grounds and to

what extent, should university departments of educational administration be involved in such activities? Given the apparently established irrelevance of their current programs to the practical world then there must be doubt, the optimism of Griffiths and Greer notwithstanding, as to whether they can realistically claim the expertise necessary to be involved in the supervision of internships or other clinical experiences. Assuming that professors are or should be included within the profession of educational administration does not ensure or demonstrate that they can actually administer schools as well or better than those that do so on a day-to-day basis. Certainly the failure of the past age to produce a science of administration implies that while academics may well be able to bring insightful understandings to administrative problems and processes, they cannot necessarily lay claim to a special body of practical skill or expertise.

Can departments of educational administration even claim any kind of legitimate jurisdiction over the supervision of internships or other practice based clinical experiences? Apart from the inclusive conception of professionalism adopted by the reformers, the operative basis for such jurisdiction would appear to be the qualifying credential which will be awarded by the university and the authority over the details of the total program which this accords to departments. But is this reasonable? Why should university departments, the National Policy Board and the proposed national certification board (Greer, 1989, p. 5) appropriate to themselves ultimate control over the nature and evaluation of practice based preparation experiences? Why not simply leave such matters to the practitioners and the appropriate state and school authorities with the academic community being

involved in a consultative capacity?

My point is that academic educational administration need not, and probably should not, be involved in all the formal elements of an ideal preparation program for school administrators, nor should the academic community presume to exercise dominion over such programs. Such an presumption represents another reversion to the ideals of the administrative progressives in the practical science age. And as Griffiths (1988) said himself when explaining the rationale for the reform model: "Each should do what each does best" (p. 14). Academic educational administration should do what the evolution of the field has uniquely prepared it to do: it should provide a solid, stimulating, reflective and mature intellectual treatment of the field. As such, university departments should rid themselves of the historically rooted grand delusion that they can or should train administrators in the specific techniques of their trade and accept that their modern mission is to educate prospective and practising administrators in the complexities of their work and responsibilities. To do this well, departments of educational administration must move closer to, rather than away from, the ideals of a liberal education traditionally embodied in the university arts and science faculties. This does not mean or imply that they should attempt or desire to become part of these other university institutions. Academic educational administration has a rich, diverse and growing body of scholarly knowledge at its disposal and need not rely on, though it can certainly make use of, the knowledge contained in other academic fields and disciplines. The classical virtue of a liberal education, however, is that it promises to liberate the thinking of

beneficiaries by helping them see beyond the constraints and conventions imposed in the world of the immediately given. This should be the proper aim of graduate programs in educational administration.

An alternate preparation program for the fifth age

What might a model of administrator preparation incorporating a liberal academic education look like? First and most fundamentally, such a model would recognize that an appropriate program would be rooted in both the action and the academic realms. But rather than attempting to forcibly blend these together, as in the osterized professional model, it would seek to preserve and capitalize on the differences between them. The professional school model tries to pretend that these differences are unimportant by promoting a spurious and anachronistic image of a community of practitioner-scholars. The dual model would acknowledge the force of eight decades of evolution in university-based approaches to the study of educational administration and attempt to build on the inherited strengths of that tradition. This would not mean that the academic and action worlds would operate as separate closed systems. As discussed in the introduction to this paper, the two realms necessarily intermingle and complement each other, but they are still essentially different and distinct and the dual model would regard this distinctiveness as being legitimate and inherently worthwhile.

As in the NCEEA (1987, p. 25) recommendations, the dual preparatory model would assign overall responsibility for the specification and administration of regulations governing the qualifications of school administrators to an appropriate licensure board established under government authority. School

systems, professionals--meaning practising administrators--, and the academic community would all have representation on this board, as might other involved constituencies such as teacher, parent and business associations. Also as in the NCEEA proposal, the dual model would incorporate each of the five strands discussed by Griffiths. In the dual model, however, departments of educational administration would only have complete responsibility for the first and third strands, that is the study of administration and the application of research. In the second case, the research element would not be as narrowly conceived as in the NCEEA proposals or Griffiths' account, nor perhaps as narrowly applied as in some contemporary programs. The main intent would be to bring the force of disciplined academic inquiry to bear on questions of interest. These questions might well be rooted in problems of practice, but they might also spring directly from the academic literature. Regardless, the prime task of university departments would be to provide a solid and broadly based graduate education in the academic knowledge of the field, successful completion of which would be signified by the award of an appropriate degree or degrees. This could be an M.Ed, Ed.D., or Ph.D depending on the career stage and aspirations of the candidates, but regardless of the level or designation it would be understood by all concerned as a respectable and worthwhile academic qualification. The attainment of a first-level graduate degree--that is a Masters level or similar qualification--would be a necessary requirement for the granting of the certificate or license needed for appointment as a principal. The attainment of a doctorate might or might not, depending on the circumstances in the jurisdiction concerned, be stipulated as a requirement for the

issuance of a superintendency license. In many instances this might be an undesirable requirement which could devalue the intrinsic benefit of additional graduate study in the field, and it could be preferable to let market forces determine both the demand for and the value of doctoral study.

Departments might also be involved in the second strand of the NCEEA program, which essentially consists of acquainting students with the specialized technical knowledge of educational administration which included, in Griffiths' account, communication and organizational skills. This is the strand of the program which is most amenable to a training approach, and there could be benefit in creating a field service unit within, or adjunct to, a department of educational administration which had as part of its mandate the provision of such training and skill development activities. The key point, however, is that while technical training of this kind might well be a requirement for licensure established by the governing body, it would not form part of the academic requirements and thus would not be included in degree programs, even on a non-credit basis. Nor need this training be necessarily offered by a department of educational administration, for appropriate training courses could be offered by a wide variety of other agencies: by the licensure board itself, professional associations, school systems, private firms, business schools, and so on. Departments would nonetheless stand to gain much by providing such training and other field services to administrators and school systems, perhaps through a principal's centre which would also provide a field oriented link to the action world of educational administration. The crucial point, however, is that work of this kind should not be confused with the prime academic mission and purpose of

the department itself.

Responsibility for the fourth and fifth strands of the NCEEA model--supervised practice and the demonstration of competence--would be assigned to the profession (meaning practitioners) and the established authorities. The academic community might well have a consultative or contractual role in either or both of these endeavors, but responsibility would, following Griffiths' logic, be given to those who have the appropriate expertise and jurisdiction. Many possible arrangements can be envisaged. Larger school systems could create a wide range of internship positions and other "understudy" or "apprenticeship" opportunities; smaller systems could make use of temporary secondments to other districts; professional associations could be involved in facilitating such exchanges and providing mentors, and so on. Similarly, the demonstration of competence requirement could be met in a variety of ways ranging from participation in a operational project in the home system or elsewhere, to formal examinations held by the licensure board or the professional association. One particular advantage of this arrangement would be that school systems and professional associations would have to make fiscal commitments to the preparation of future administrators and they would have a direct and formal role in the overall preparation process. In short, the academic community would not bear ultimate responsibility for the preparation of administrators, nor would it be solely accountable for the outcomes. Furthermore, such a division of responsibilities will also help provide the independence from "the Sovereign"--that is the power of the state and established authority--which Greenfield (1986) argues is fundamental if academic educational

administration is to enjoy the freedom to openly examine "the values that power serves" (p. 74).

Finally, it is worthwhile to reflect on how the content and orientation of the degree programs in such a dual model might differ from those in the program described by Griffiths. The most significant difference would lie in the understood purpose of the program. From the accounts given by Griffiths and Greer, it appears that the core academic content in the professional model would consist of the conceptual knowledge and research findings that entered the literature during the theoretical science period, garnished with a selection of more recent ideas and insights. It seems that the emphasis, nonetheless, would be placed on presenting this content as knowledge which is useful to school administrators in their work, the underlying rationale remaining that of training prospective administrators through the dissemination of a specialist body of professional knowledge.

Yet, as has hopefully been demonstrated in the first part of this paper, the evolution of academic educational administration has produced a large and complex body of literature that offers many pathways to better understanding and gaining insight into the purposes, problems and processes of practical educational administration. This literature contains many dead ends; many different, and some inherently contradictory, ways of understanding the world of practice; but when approached as a body of academic knowledge, these characteristics can be seen as strengths and not weaknesses. Ideally, the degree programs envisaged in the dual model advocated here would draw on and from all of these apparent and promised strengths in an open and free-ranging search for enhanced understanding. The fruits of the theoretical

science era would not be ignored, but neither would inquiry be constrained by the bounds of that knowledge or the positivistic heritage it bears with it. Cubberley and Callahan, Griffiths and Greenfield, Halpin and Hodgkinson, the relics of the school survey movement, modern exploratory data analysis techniques, the insights of qualitative research; all these and other ways of seeking knowledge and insight into the nature of administration and the condition of administrators would be welcomed and available for use. But above all else, the courses and the degree program itself would be designed to facilitate and further the study of educational administration through its extant and evolving academic literature and the application of the knowledge therein to the realm of administrative action. This emphasis would be communicated clearly and unambiguously to students and the professional community. Here, they would be told, we study, and do not teach, educational administration. Here, we offer insight and understanding, not training and technique. Here, we stand ready to learn from administrators, rather than tell them what is best.

Some of the specific emphases and content that would seem particularly appropriate in such programs if academic educational administration is to move into its promised fifth age of academic maturity would be:

* Attempts to reflect on and learn from the rich history of academic and practical educational administration and relate such learnings to current and emergent situations. There is undoubtedly much work to be done in seeking a better understanding of the development of the field. Culbertson has helped to show us the way here, but we can also learn from educational historians and hopefully encourage

them to work more closely with us.

* Deeper and more sustained attention to the philosophical questions of administration and its inherently moral nature, with particular attention being given to the influence of values in administrative action . Hodgkinson has provided us with a good beginning in this area, but again there is a virtually limitless scope for inquiry, theory building and seminar work.

* Wider and broader attempts to understand schools as unique social phenomena. The literature of organizational theory will continue to have relevance here as it too evolves, but the perspectives of critical theory may provide particularly valuable material for classroom work. Specific attention could be paid here to exploring both the structure and effects of schools and the whole apparatus of state schooling. The construction of the curriculum and the sociology of knowledge should also be considered in this context.

* Closer and more penetrating treatments of the nature and use of authority and power in organizational settings. Administrators are instruments and creators of authority, but there has been a tendency to cloak the difficult realities of this truth in abstractions and euphemisms. Both the personal and institutional exercise of authority provide much room for exploration, particularly with regard to policy formation, decision making and judgement and the role of values and power in such activities.

* Specific attention should also be given to the subjective reality of organizational life and action as experienced and constructed by both those who administer and those who are administered. Greenfield, of course, has shown us the way forward here and he should be heeded. In particular, his recent outline of a possible agenda for fifth age research provides additional topics for study which complement the few noted here (1986, p. 75-6).

Conclusion

In this paper I have tried to argue for the preservation and extension of the academic study of educational administration. I have tried to show that academic interest and work in the field has progressed through a number of relatively distinct stages to reach its present state of emergent maturity. At the present juncture, however, a popular press for excellence and effectiveness in the United States has generated proposals for the restructuring of departments of educational administration which threaten to impede or even destroy the prospect for mature and serious academic work in the field, at least in that country. An alternate model for the education and training of educational administrators was therefore presented as a means of sustaining the academic evolution of the field and capitalizing on its implicit and promised strengths.

The arguments advanced in the development of the paper are of course by no means new or novel. The inherent relevance of academic work to the everyday world has been recognized and demonstrated throughout our history, and many others have argued for its preservation in the face of zealous reformers seeking to diminish or overthrow its virtues in the name of

practicality. Ellwood Patterson Cubberley was one such defender and advocate of the value of academic work, and his frozen thoughts provide a fitting end to this paper:

> In education as in other lines of work, the old statement that the distinctive function of a university is not action, but thought, has been exemplified (1934, p. 690)

Let us keep it so.

References

Bates, R. J. (1983). Educational administration and the management of knowledge. Victoria, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Berman, B. (1983, Fall). Business efficiency, American schooling, and the public school superintendency: A reconsideration of the Callahan thesis. History of Education Quarterly, 23, 297-321.

Boyan, N. J. (Ed.). (1988). Handbook of Research on Educational Administration. New York: Longman.

Callahan, R. E. (1962). Education and the cult of efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Campbell, R. F., Fleming, T., Newell, L. J., & Bennion, J. W. (1987). A history of thought and practice in educational administration. New York: Teachers College Press.

Campbell, R. F., & Lipham, J. M. (Eds.). (1960). Administrative theory as a guide to action. Chicago: Midwest Centre, University of Chicago.

Cohen, D. K., & Lazerson, M. (1977). Education and the corporate order. In J. Karabel & A. H. Halsey (Eds.), Power and ideology in education, (pp. 373-386). New York: Oxford University Press.

Cremin, L. A., Shannon, D. A., & Townsend, M. E. (1954). A history of Teachers College, Columbia University. New York: Columbia University Press.

Cremin, L. A. (1965). The wonderful world of Ellwood Patterson Cubberley. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Cubberley, E. P. (1919). Public education in the United States. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Cubberley, E. P. (1922). Public school administration. (Revised edition). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Cubberley, E. P. (1923). The principal and his school: The organization, administration and supervision of instruction in an elementary school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Cubberley, E. P. (1928). Public school administration. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Cubberley, E. P. (1934). Public education in the United States. (Revised and enlarged edition). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Culbertson, J. A. (1983). Theory in educational administration: Echoes from critical thinkers. Educational Researcher, 3(10), 15-22.

Culbertson, J. A. (1988). A century's quest for a knowledge base. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Educational Administration (pp. 3-26). New York: Longman.

Dutton, S. T., & Snedden D. (1908). The administration of public education in the United States. New York: Macmillan.

Dutton, S. T., & Snedden D. (1916). The administration of public education in the United States. (Revised Edition). New York: Macmillan.

Engelhardt, F. (1931). Public school organization and administration. Boston: Ginn and Company.

Getzels, J. W. (1952). A psycho-sociological framework for the study of educational administration. Harvard Educational Review, 22(4), 235-246.

Greenfield. T. B. (1975). Theory about organization: A new perspective and its implications for schools. In M. Hughes (Ed.) Administering education: International challenge (pp. 71-99). London: Athlone Press.

Greenfield. T. B. (1986). The decline and fall of science in educational administration. Interchange, 17(2), 57-80.

Greer, J. T. (1989). UCEA Presidential address, 1988. An optimist's view. UCEA Review, 30(1), 5-7.

Griffiths, D. E. (1979). Intellectual turmoil in educational administration. Educational Administration Quarterly, 13(3), 43-65.

Griffiths, D. E. (1988). Educational administration: Reform PDQ or RIP. (Occasional paper #8312). Tempe, AZ: The University Council for Educational Administration.

Griffiths, D. E. (1988). Administrative theory. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Educational Administration (pp. 27-51). New York: Longman.

Halpin, A. W. (1958). The development of theory in educational administration. In A. W. Halpin (Ed.), Administrative theory in education. Chicago: Midwest Centre, The University of Chicago.

Hodgkinson, C. (1978). Towards a philosophy of administration. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hodgkinson, C. (1983). The philosophy of leadership. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Moehlman, A. B. (1940). School administration. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. (1987). Leaders for America's Schools. Tempe, AZ: The University Council for Educational Administration.

Newlon, J. H. (1934). Educational administration as social policy. (Report of the Commission on the Social Studies, Part VIII). New York: Scribner.

Ortiz, F. I., & Marshall, C. (1988). Women in educational administration. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Educational Administration (pp. 123-141). New York: Longman.

Passow, H. A. (1989). Present and future directions in school reform. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. H. Moore (Eds.), Schooling for tomorrow: Directing reforms to issues that count. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Reeder, W. G. (1941) The fundamentals of public school administration. (Revised and enlarged edition). New York: Macmillan.

Sears, J. B. (1922). Techniques of the public school survey. Journal of Educational Research, 6, 281-299.

Sears, J. B. (1925). The school survey. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Simon, H. (1945). Administrative behavior. New York: Macmillan.

Spaulding, F. E., Burris, W. P., & Elliot, E. C. (1910). The aims, scope and method of a university course in public school administration. Indianapolis, IN: National Society for College Teachers of Education.

Strayer, G. D., & Thorndike, E. L. (1912). Educational administration. New York: Macmillan.

Tyack, D. B. (1974). The one best system. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tyack, D. & Hansot, E. (1982). Managers of virtue: Public school leadership in America, 1820-1980. New York: Basic Books.

Footnotes

1. Others have offered similar evolutionary accounts, but for the most part these other typologies tend to address the changes in the descriptive and normative images held of practitioners. Thus Callahan's (1962) recognition of four stages in the development of administrator training are referenced to the evolving image of the superintendent as scholarly leader, business manager, democratic statesman, and applied social scientist. Other "stage models" are often based on the paradigmatic evolution of the "parent" academic domains of organizational and administrative theory. Thus, the four stages in the development of thought in academic educational administration recognized by Campbell, Fleming, Newell & Bennion (1987) are scientific management, democratic administration and human relations, rediscovered rationalism as exemplified by Weberian bureaucracy, and open systems thinking. Culbertson's (1988) review of the development of study in educational administration is more in tune with my interests in this paper and has been used as a major guide, although the confines of a single paper make the account that can be offered here regrettably brief.

2. The list of doctoral theses given by Newlon (1934, pp. 273-290) contains one dated 1910 presented at Clark University, one 1911 presented at Chicago, the students concerned presumably having begun their studies prior to 1910. A total of 39 theses in Newlon's list were completed between 1910 and 1920; 23 were completed at Columbia and 16 at 8 other universities, including Iowa 2.(4), Chicago (3), Pennsylvania (3), and Clark (2).

3. My count differs from that presented in Campbell et al. (1987, p. 180), but that could well be because mine was conducted late one night while I was frantically rushing to complete this paper. The magnitude of the difference between the sheer volume of doctoral work undertaken at Columbia and other Universities nonetheless remains the same. My count ranked Chicago a far distant second with 18 listed dissertations, then Iowa (15), California (11) and Stanford (10). Seven other universities had awarded between 6 and 8 doctorates, and nine others between 2 and 4.

4. Cubberley (1934) also tells us that "the first city to make a beginning in the establishment of research work was Rochester, N.Y., in 1911, when a municipal expert was employed to advise the board of education on accounting and finance, and in 1913 a Bureau of School Efficiency was established" (p. 545).